

## ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ, ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ И МЕТОДЫ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

ШКОЛА И. Я. ФРОЯНОВА (К 80-ЛЕТИЮ УЧЕНОГО)

UDC 93/94

*A. Yu. Dvornichenko*

### THE PLACE OF THE KIEVAN RUS IN HISTORY

The article examines an important and urgent issue: place of Kievan Rus in history. 'Kievan Rus' is a conventional name for the first centuries of the East Slavic history (9<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries), which after the collapse of the USSR has been a bone of contention between scientists from Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. Whose history? It is the basis of what sort of state? What is its nature? These and many other questions still remain unanswered. Considering historiographical and historical discourses, the author proposes a solution to this problem, the option most appropriate to historical reality and reconciling all parties. Refs 60.

*Keywords:* Kievan Rus, historiography, township (city-state), community and Church, 'old Russian nationality', 'East Slavic antiquity'.

*А. Ю. Дворниченко*

### МЕСТО КИЕВСКОЙ РУСИ В ИСТОРИИ

В статье рассматривается важная и актуальная проблема: место Киевской Руси в истории. «Киевская Русь» — это условное название восточнославянской истории в течение первых ее веков (IX–XIII век), которая после краха СССР была яблоком раздора между учеными из России, Украины и Белоруссии. Чья история? Основа какого из государств? Каков ее характер? Эти и много других вопросов все еще остаются без ответа. Рассматривая историографические и исторические дискурсы, автор предлагает решение этой проблемы, выбор, наиболее соответствующий исторической действительности и примиряющий все стороны. Библиогр. 60 назв.

*Ключевые слова:* Киевская Русь, историография, города (город-государство), община и церковь, «народность», «восточнославянская античность».

---

*Dvornichenko Andrey Yurievich* — Doctor of History, Professor, St. Petersburg State University, Institute of History, 7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; a.dvornichenko@spbu.ru

*Дворниченко Андрей Юрьевич* — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Институт истории, Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; a.dvornichenko@spbu.ru

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2016

«Кстати, о Киевской Руси.  
Кажется, значение ее доселе никем еще не было понято».

Ю. Ф. Самарин

«О мнениях 'Современника', исторических  
и литературных»

'By the way, about Kievan Rus.  
It seems, up to now nobody understand its significance'.

Iu. F. Samarin

'On Opinions of the 'Contemporary', historical and  
literary'

This problem seems to be beyond the circle of 'real scholarly questions'. But without solving such general problems we could not go forward in studying particular ones. The period of the so called 'Kievan Rus' is very important in the common history of the three contemporary states: Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. By the way, I am sure, that a correct form is just 'Rus', because term 'Russia' appeared only at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

'Kievan Rus' is an artificial scholarly term for the first centuries of the history of the east Slavs, approximately from 9<sup>th</sup> (or 8<sup>th</sup>) to the beginning of 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. Historians began to comprehend this period as integral, united, important and differ from the others periods only at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Even in the classical work written by the famous Ukrainian historian M. S. Hrushevsky, 'Kievan Rus' is only part of the history of the so-called 'Ukraine-Rus'. Perhaps, no sooner than A. Ie. Presnyakov (St. Petersburg University) in his famous works ('The Law of Princes in Old Rus' and 'Lectures on Russian History') finally made 'Kievan Rus' the individual object of scientific analysis. Such approach was developed in Soviet historiography, which had great enthusiasm for this subject.

It was a long hard way from the 'Kievan Rus', written by B. D. Grekov and 'Old Rus' by V. V. Mavrodin to the 'Kievan Rus and Old Russian Principalities' of B. A. Rybakov, and the bestseller, which had been prepared by I. Ia. Froianov. Among the emigré writers, three remarkable volumes were devoted to this theme by G. Vernadsky. I mentioned only five names, but we have dozens of names! I only want to show that once upon a time 'Kievan Rus' had been an object of great interest. And one can also see the Soviet approach to this period in an article written by the well-known historian M. N. Tihomirov. It's interesting that it was first published in Kiev in the Ukrainian language and only after the death of the author was it translated into Russian.

He is sure of the existence of the 'Kievan State', which was one of the biggest states in medieval Europe [Tihomirov M. N. 1975, p. 22]. He writes about the high level of handicrafts, about feudal relations and class struggle and the high level of culture, which reflects the tastes of feudal lords. And then he admired the role of the Rus in international affairs even during the period of 'feudal division'. Such an approach dominated Soviet historiography before the works of I. Ya. Froianov.

But long before this time 'Kievan Rus' appeared at the centre of the struggle between Russian and Ukrainian historians. Russian historians from the time of N. M. Karamzin presumed, albeit unconsciously, that 'Kievan Rus' was just the first stage of Russian history. The truth is that the Russian historians did not see the Ukraine and its history in

the whole: all regions from Dnepr to Warsaw called West Russia. Only the terrible Polish rebellion of 1830 could compel Russians to notice as Poland as Ukraine. The question was very simple: who will be owner of these territories — Poland or Russian Empire?

And now an interpretation of the 'Kievan Rus' as a 'cradle of Russian nation' was the foundation for the claims from the side of Russia [Miller A. 2013, p. 297]. In the 1850s we can see discussion in the Slavophile magazine *Russkaia beseda* between the Russian historian M. P. Pogodin and the philologist, former rector of Kievan University M. A. Maksimovich. According to Pogodin's opinion, the population of 'Kievan Rus' were Russians. Under the influence of Mongol invasion they changed their territory and went to the North-Eastern Rus and so just this region in the form of Susdalia and then in the form of the Great Duke of Moscow became the heir of 'Kievan Rus'. The territory left behind was occupied with the migrants from the West Ukraine [Miller A. I. 2000, p. 69–71].

A. P. Tolochko noticed that Pogodin factually played on the part of Ukrainians, because Maksimovich was not the admirer of separate and independent history of Ukraine. Being the philologist, he maintained the idea of the close relationship between the two languages [Tolochko A. P. 2012, p. 222, 225]. In the whole both scholars thought primarily about nationality and language.

This approach was continued by the prominent historian N. I. Kostomarov. His nationalism had a bright ethological character: he postulated two Russian nationalities or, later, six [Rubinshtejn N. L. 2008, p. 487–491]. He did not speak about a state in 'Kievan Rus'. On his opinion, Rus had only the form of federation, in this political mass one can find the shoots of federation, monarchy and republic [Kostomarov N. I. 1994, p. 80; Kostomarov N. I. 1994, p. 167].

Discussion renewed under the new, special circumstances of the 1880s. This was a complex period for the development of nationalism in Russian Empire. Under the press of autocracy nobody wanted to discuss these problems. The silence was broken by the talented philologist and the man of right-leaning convictions A. I. Sobolevskij. He published an article under characteristic title: 'How Did the Population of Kiev in the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Centuries Speak?' [Sobolevsky A. I. 1888, pp. 215–218] He corrected the conception of Pogodin: the population of 'Kievan Rus' did not migrate to Susdalia, but the culture of this population had been destroyed [Sobolevsky A. I. 1980, p. 40].

As A. P. Tolochko noticed, the Ukrainian historians of the school of V. B. Antonovich answered simply and naively. Antonovich himself drew one the unbroken history of Kiev from the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 16<sup>th</sup> centuries [Antonovich V. B. 1885, pp. 221–264]. His pupils studied the history of the different Old Russian lands from ancient times until the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, and also showed the unbroken development in these lands [Tolochko A. P. 2012, pp. 233–4].

But the creator of the 'long Ukrainian history' was M. S. Hrushevsky. He began this history from the settling of the Slavs and from the creation of the first state. On his opinion, the Kievan state was the result of the creative activity of the Ukrainian people. Russians appeared later as the result of a mix between Slavs and Finno-Ugric tribes on the Volga and Oka rivers. Russians borrowed the law and culture of the 'Kievan Rus' approximately so just as they had taken the culture of Byzantium [Hrushevsky M. S. 1991, pp. 76–7].

It's very important for the aims of this article to stress that it was this great Ukrainian historian who finally created the state 'Kievan Rus'. But I shall return to this theme shortly.

After the works of Hrushevskiy the arguments went round the problem of the national character of the 'Kievan state'. And these discussions became more bitter than they had been, because the state is very valuable thing and everybody wants to have one as the beginning of their history.

These discussions continued among the emigrés. Before it the centre of Ukrainian historiography was Lvov. In books and articles published in this city and in Warsaw one can find this notorious 'Kievan state'. The historians took it with them in emigration: to Europe, the USA, Canada. Russian emigrants struggled in these discussions against Ukrainians. Among Russian historians were simple enthusiasts, such as prince S. M. Bolkonsky, and were great scientists as lawyer F. V. Taranovsky or historian G. V. Vernadsky. The situation deteriorated when Belorussians and Jews took part in the scuffle.

Belarus did not give rise to such a great historian as Hrushevsky, but the local national intellectuals also were finding their 'own ancient state'. In 1910 V. Iu. Lastovsky published his 'The Short History of Belarus'. This is the first book written for Belorussians by a Belorussian and in the Belorussian language [Hryitskevich A. P. 1991, p. 8]. The author glorified the 'Belarus tribes' (Krivichi, Dregovich, etc.) and considered the territory of Belarus as the centre of the ancient 'Kievan state' [Lastovsky V. Iu. 1993, pp. 7–8]. This argument was extended by U. M. Ignatovsky, M. V. Dovnar-Zapolsky, and emigré historians.

Jewish historians also dreamed about this dubious 'state' especially as they had such phenomenon as Khazaria with its Judaism and great influence on Kievan Rus. It's very interesting, that the first scholar who discovered the main role of Khazars in creation of 'Kievan state' was not a Jew, but the Petersburg's philologist, Slavophil V. I. Lamansky. Such an idea was supported by some Jews authors who 'find the historical base for their presence in Russia from ancient times' [Shnirelman V. A. 2010, p. 321]. And this approach had some followers, for example: the famous Canadian historian Omelyan Pritsak [Pritsak Omelyan. 1997].

The specific situation can we see in Soviet historiography especially in 1920s and 30s. The chief Soviet historian M. N. Pokrovsky even accepted the theory of Hrushevsky about the Ukrainian character of 'Kievan Rus', though he did not find the state in its history. He repeated his own views which he had iterated in the prerevolutionary period [Pokrovsky M. N. 1932, pp. 34–38]. And he was not alone! Many historians such as N. L. Rubinshtejn, S. V. Bachruschin, etc. also supported this theory [Dvornichenko A. Yu. 2014, p. 193–216].

But then the situation changed and Soviet historians joined Hrushevsky's bandwagon: they became to create the concept of 'Kievan state'. In their imagination it was a great state with a huge territory and very, very strong. It's very difficult to answer the question: 'Where did it disappear to?' But in this case they enlisted invasions and wars which some centuries ago had destroyed this state and its civilization. The chief builder of this construction was B. D. Grekov, but then this conception became generally accepted and seemed as the scar.

But in 80s appeared innovative works of Igor Yakovlevich Froianov and in the course of time his school was to appear. The Leningrad historians were interested in not 'whose' state this was, but what it was and was it as the whole? [Froianov I. Ya. 1980; Froianov I. Ya., Dvornichenko A. Yu., 1986]. The Ukrainian historians through the press of Party-State control tried to show the 'Kievan Rus' as Ukrainian and believed in an ancient state. The bright example is M. Yu. Braychevskij who wrote about 'Kievan Rus' as Ukrainian, but just state! [Isaevich Ya. D. 1994, p. 242–249]. So we could see such pretensions for Kievan

Rus and from the side of Kazakhs. I mean the uproarious book of O. Suleimenov 'Us and I'. And the Kazakhs also have their truth, because their ancestors, Komani (Polovtsi and others), actively took part in Kievan Rus.

After the break-up of Soviet Union and formation of independent Ukraine discussions were renewed with great power. Some scholars (P. P. Tolochko, N. F. Kotliar, etc) very carefully tried to unite the 'Old Russian State' and 'Kievan State', in other words find the state in ancient times and make the Ukrainian history very long. But many contemporary specialists made this, as Mayakovsij said 'heavy, crude and obvious'. The bright example is the book of G. P. Pivtorak. Formerly he studied 'ridnu movu' and now he created a historical science. He is sure of such a 'Ukrainian state' — 'Kievan State' [Pivtorak G. P. 2001, p. 48, etc]. What about Pivtorak? This 'Ukrainian state' one can find in every school textbook [Portnov A. V. 2010, p. 136]. We can understand our colleges, their efforts to make the base for the national contemporary state. But who at fault for our unfortunate history?

Their part in this comedic symphony is played by the Byelorussians. Though their intentions more modest. The Byelorussian children usually read in their textbooks about glorious way from an military democracy to the Duke of Polozk — the 'first Belorussian state' [Shtyihav G. V., Plyashevich U. K. 1993, p. 104–105]. The Russian historians once decided to find new capital of the 'Kievan State' and suggested for this role... Old Ladoga. Another variant is Novgorod, but, to my mind, the finest exit from this complex situation is to say to the 'Kievan State' — 'good-bye!' Here I can give only some remarks and the details one can find in my works [Dvornichenko A. Yu. 2010, etc].

The history of Kievan Rus one can divide on two periods: 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries and 11<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. The essence of the first period is moving society from a military democracy to a chiefdom. From complex chiefdom Rus could go to the state, but the History gave another impulse. During the next period we can see the formation of the city-states (*zemli, volosti*). Such social and political organizations we can meet in different parts of the Earth and they, of course, differ one from the another. Our city-states are similar to the archaic Ancient Greece *polis* and factually they had not been the states in the sense of this word. These were not states, but the systems of subordinate communes. The main political institute was *veche* — the meeting of the population of the main commune which located in the old, senior town. The prerogatives of *veche* were very wide, but an ruler (so called 'kniaz', prince) also played great role in political system. In another words *veche* was the legislative organ and it did not usually interfere in the managment of the *volost*.

The comparison between city-states of Kievan Rus and the *polis* of Ancient World became commonplace in Russian historiography of the pre-revolution period, among emigrants and foreign scholars alike [Dvornichenko A. Yu. 2014]. In 1986, in special work the historians of Leningrad university made the comparison of Kievan Rus with the Greek *polis* and with Byzantium. This researcher confirmed the innocence of our predecessors [Froyanov I. Ya., Dvornichenko A. Yu. 1986, pp. 193–330].

These city-states struggled amongst each other and the ties between them were weak. Academician D. S. Likhachev saw only three such ties: the Church, princes and literature [Lihachev D. S. 1981, pp. 169–179]. These ties were not enough to preserve state unity. In Kievan Rus there was not only no state, but also no state law. Russian Justice was a very archaic monument of law, more archaic than the European codes of that time. Russian Justice and other laws of Kievan Russia reflect horizontal legal ties [Kaiser Daniel H., 1980].

Factually there was no vertical structure in the law connected with state power. But we see the power of people, and the role of community in law, among other things. The law of Kievan Rus was ambivalent, serving only the base for the later law systems such as the Law of Moscovy or the the Grand Duke of Lithuania.

In such ambivalent position also was the Church. It became now also the object of discussions. Ukrainian historians deny that the Kievan Church was a creature of Byzantium, they attempt to demonstrate its autocephaly [Andrew Wilson. 2002, p. 11–14]. So, P. P. Tolochko says that the dependence on the Byzantine patriarch was only 'canonical', in 'the whole Kievan metropolis was a self-governing Church structure, based on national interests' [Tolochko P. P. 2005, p. 134]. In my opinion this is a modernization of history.

Christianity and Church appeared in Kievan Rus in the conditions of primitive society. Baptism was the only link in the chain of pagan 'reforms' [Froianov I. Ya., Dvornichenko A. Yu., Krivosheev Yu. V. 1992, p. 3–15]. This situation only increased the dependence of the Kievan Church of Constantinople. D. S. Likhachev noticed that when Byzantium created the Church in lands of the barbarians, it wanted by this step to attempt to manage the absence of a state in the lands of barbarians [Lihachev D. S. 1945, p. 18]. Every Greek Metropolitan was simultaneously the spy of the Empire. Only two Metropolitans were from the native population and these attempts to make the 'national Church' did not play a significant role.

But more important were the specifics of Church organization, which was in direct dependence from the religious situation. Before Mongol invasion, Christianity only glided on the surface of Rus society and did not penetrate in it deeply. The society was in its foundations pagan. Under these conditions, the Church was held in a rudimentary status and 'tried as much as possible to adapt to local conditions' [Schapov Ya. N. 1981, p. 64]. The structure of the church was small: only one Metropolitan and dozen dioceses. The famous Church historian E. E. Golubinsky considered this structure very typical for the Kievan Rus, which distinguished it from Byzantium [Golubinsky E. E. 1901, 341]. The prominent emigrant historian A. V. Kartashev supposed that in 1037 was sharp turn from the policy of 'national Church autonomy' to the Juridical dependence on Byzantium [Kartashev A. V. 1992, p. 167]. To my mind it is more correct to speak not about 'Church autonomy', but about the weakness of church structure, which did not build a clear structure.

The Rus Church tried to adapt to princes and to the communes, to become the part of commune [Dvornichenko A. Yu., 1988]. And this, by the way, restricted the possibilities of Church policy of centralization. The Russian Church flourished only in Mongol period. Exactly at this time, as Russian emigrant historians showed, was shaped the 'Holy Rus' [Pax Rossica. 2012, p. 103–112]. In the different conditions would be the religion on the lands of 'West Rus' in the composition of the Poland and Lithuania. And here the process of the formation of 'Ukrainian' and 'Belorussian' Orthodoxy and a Church had been begun. In another words the religion and Church in Kievan Rus were ambivalent, neutral and from them could appear any branch of Christianity, even Uniatism. In this sense it's interesting to compare Kievan Russia with Lithuania. In the Baptism of the East Slavs and Lithuanians there were many common features [Dvornichenko A. Yu. 2015]. But the internal situation changed and the Lithuanians became Catholics.

So, there was no state in Kievan Rus, the Church was in an embryonic status... And what about the Old Russian nationality (*drevnerusskaia narodnost*)? We could not find this notion in Russian historiography of the pre-revolutionary period — there was no ne-

cessity for it. The situation resembled that of the historiography of the 20s–30s years: historians used different terms — ‘Russian people’, ‘Russians’, ‘Russian Slavs’, ‘Slavs’, etc. But when the Soviet historians under the guidance of Communist Party created the ‘Kievan State’ they felt an necessity of new term for the population of this ‘state’.

The creation of the conception ‘Old Russian nationality’ was the response to the challenge of time. Recently, the deceased now Ukrainian historian N. Iusova studied how this conception had been created [Iusova N. 2005]. The main creator was the famous scholar from Leningrad — V. V. Mavrodin. But he was very cautious in his opinions. From one side, he shows the formation of the ‘nationality’, as a result of appearance of the state. But, from the other side, he said that this ‘state’ was rather primitive and for this reason couldn’t unit the population of the Rus into integral ‘nationality’ [Mavrodin V. V. 1945, 395].

Contemporary defenders of the ‘Old Rus nationality’ are in the comic situation. So, the well-known Ukrainian historian, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences wrote in his recent book: ‘On the first step of the history of Rus only the state gave to the ethnic development of the East Slavs a high level of unity... On the second step which was defined by the historians as feudal disintegration, already, the Old Rus ethno-cultural community (or nationality) became the main clamp for the state’ [Tolochko P. P. 2005, p. 25]. There is very comic deduction which can prove everything.

The defenders also use and such ‘clamps’ for the ‘nationality’, as cities and Christianity [Sedov V. V. 1999, p. 214–219]. The defenders themselves understand the insufficiency of these ‘clamps’ and they have to find the ancient native land of this ‘nationality’ [Zagorulsky E. 2002, pp. 108–109], though all are already tired of the search for the ‘native lands’ of the Slavs. Or the Old Russian Nationality is expressed as the ‘imagined commutity’ in the manner of B. Anderson [Tolochko A. 2001, p. 32–33].

D. S. Likhachev noticed that ‘the weakness of the connections in East Europe was sensed from the beginning, when the historical consciousness appeared’ [Lihachev D. S. 1981, p. 169]. We all know the tribal names of East Slavs: Polochane, Kiane, Smoliane, etc. Some of these names lived very long, for example, Severiane whom we can meet (as ‘Sevriuki’) even in the documents of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. But what do they mean, what stands behind these names? It’s only clear that there is tribal system.

A. E. Presnyakov discovered that the city-states (volosti, zemli) appeared on the ruins of the ‘tribal mode of life’, which they destroyed by themselves [Presnyakov A. E. 1938, p. 62]. In 70s the well-known ethnographer L. P. Lashuk thought about this phenomenon. He used the term ‘koinoniia’, which he took from the works of Aristotle. The Greek thinker used this notion for the best understanding the evolution of ancient Greek society: from an ancient family to a polis. Lashuk discovered these social organisms among South and East Slavs [Lashuk L. P. 1977, pp. 77–83, 85]. I think that these are the equivalent of our city-states, but their ethnic character is very complex problem. What is the degree of the ethnic in such social organism?

Especially, in language: the dialectic borders went not along the borders of ‘koinoniia’ (lands) but in different directions [Filin F. P. 1972, p. 636]. The well-known scholar V. V. Sedov puts an accent on language and tries to compare our ‘lands’ with western lands, such as ‘Sacsonia’ (Saxony), Tiuringia and so on [Sedov V. V. 1999, p. 253]. But he noticed himself that European names of the lands are ethnic, instead of our lands named as the chief cities. If we find in Europe ‘Municheniiu’ or ‘Dresdeniiu’ and so on in this case we could speak about resemblance.

I see resemblance with the ancient Greece. Every ancient Greek was, first off all, the citizen of his city-state, but at the same time he was the part of great community [Bonnar A. 1992, p. 34]. Of course, we have the problem of 'Rus', 'Russkaia zemlia' (Russian Land). The literature on this theme is enormous and I have no opportunity to characterize it. I can only remind the reader that there are two main views: in early times this was the territory in the region of Middle Dnepr between Kiev, Cernigov and Pereiaslavl or from the 'beginning' this was the wholly territory of the East Slavs. Anyway, we have no foundations to tell for this time about 'all Russians patriotism' or about 'all national psychology'.

We can take any feature of the life or the culture of Kievan Rus and it there is a unique or ambivalent, or neutral in attitude for the future. Never later in East Europe would human beings be so free, never had they such democracy. And they were literate. Literacy and characters appeared here at the period of the formation of the city-states, approximate to the conditions of ancient Greece [Froyanov I. Ya., Dvornichenko A. Yu., Krivosheev Yu. V., 1999]. It was a good instrument to intensify internal and external communal interaction.

As for the language and literary culture Kievan Rus had good fortune. We can discuss the problems of Old Russian literary language, but it is clear that it is not Latin. And, also, the Church-Slavonic language is not Latin. The Church-Slavonic texts had come from Bulgaria (the Slavic country) and formed the basis of the Old Russian literature [Sobolevsky A. I. 1980, p. 33]. This heritage was overdone during the period of Kievan Rus. But even if Russian authors did not know the Church-Slavic language well, in their books one can see a pleasant mix between the Church-Slavic elements and the elements of Old Rus language. The most important is that the whole of the population was literate and people all liked to write, among them on the different objects and the walls. Never ever was our population were so literate before the Soviet period. And we could not agree with the Ukrainian specialists that this language was Ukrainian [Nimchuk V. V. 2001, p. 687–688].

The fine arts came from Byzantium as well. And this heritage was also overdone, but we have not to exaggerate the independence of Old Russian arts, particularly for the ancient period. As we know Church architecture and painting appeared at the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. and there were models from Byzantium. The arts of the East Slavs acquired clear peculiarities beyond the borders of chronology of the Kievan Rus period.

Some words we can say about the economy of the Kievan Rus. The main conclusion which was made by our scholars in the 20<sup>th</sup> century is that the economy had a complex character: one can find here hunting, fishing, trade and farming. In another words the economy was also ambivalent — it could give the beginning to some different forms of economy. And if in the future Eastern Europe was dominated by primitive commerce and farming, Kievan Rus has no guilt.

Perhaps, the biggest invention of the historiography and at the same time the biggest error is feudalism in Kievan Rus. The main Soviet historian B. D. Grekov took the conception of N. P. Pavlov-Silvanskij and overdid it. The matter of fact is that Pavlov-Silvanskij 'discovered' feudalism in 13–15<sup>th</sup> centuries. but the previous period in Rus, in his opinion, was a communal one. Grekov transferred feudalism in the Kievan Rus and so made it very old. But in the 1950s it was clear that the sources which could confirm the early appearance of feudalism in the form of big patrimony are absent.

And then another great academician L. V. Cherepnin suggested his own conception which also had 'pre-revolutionary' roots. In fact, the Soviet academician suggested a theo-



ry close to the conception of the prominent lawyer and historian B. N. Chicherin: supreme property in the Kievan Rus. According to this theory, the first Old Russian princes were not only the leaders and managers of the society but also the owners of all land of Kievan Russia. And the contribution from the subjugated tribes was feudal rent [Froyanov I. Ya. *Kievskaya Rus*. 1990].

Further investigations showed that these conceptions were erroneous. The patrimonies looked like islands in the sea of the communal lands (I. Ya. Froianov). The city-states could not combine with feudalism [Dvornichenko A. Yu. 1988]. This lands could develop in the future or couldn't. The Old Rus nobility existed thanks to different forms of the feedings and contents. As for the conception of supreme property we can firmly say that there is a figment of the scholar's imagination...

So, all the features of the life of the Kievan Russia, of its structure had neutral or ambivalent character. They couldn't determine or define the future economical, political and cultural history. For the better understanding of the role of the Kievan Rus we have to look to the next fate of these lands. I want to stress the merits of the school of Froianov in the study of these fates. The greater part of the lands of the Kievan Rus became the foundation for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. On the basis of the Vladimir's land under the conditions of Mongol's 'yoke' formed the Grand Duchy of Moscow [Krivosheev Yu. V. 1999].

In these cases the first East Slavs archaic states appeared (military-service states) [Dvornichenko A. Yu. 2010], and the process of formation of nationalities had begun. I want to stress, that it has been only the beginning of very long process of state genesis. In one case it was closely related to Lithuania. Here the archaic military-service state in the 16<sup>th</sup> century converted in to a 'real' estate state and then united with the Poland into the one state. We notice the process of formation of the Ukrainian and Belarusian states even in the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

In another case it can be connected to the the Mongols because the growing Moscow state was the part of great Mongol Empire. Here, the archaic military-service state in the 16<sup>th</sup> century began to transform into State-Service Order, which took shape in the whole to the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century [Dvornichenko A. Yu. 2010]. Velikij Novgorod, one of the Old Rus lands, had a different fate. It developed in the form of an ancient Rus city-state. In the course of time one can see the new essence in this old form: the formation of the patrimonies and, as the result of this process, the rise of the estates. All these processes had weakened Novgorod and it became the victim of Moscovite expansion.

Some words must be devoted to another version, Galicia. Here is one more historiographical myth. In the period of Kievan Rus this land developed as did the others: it was a typical city-state. A totality of foreign policy factors prolonged the autonomy of this land in the conditions of the invasions. And the Ukrainian historians attach special importance to this region [Richka V. M. 2005. P. 119–136]. Already M. S. Hrushevsky considered it as 'a state strong and comfortable' [Hrushevsky M. S. 1991, p. 75]. S. Tomashevskiy called the united by the prince Roman Galich and Vladimir — the first Ukrainian state [Tomashivsky S. 1919, p. 85–89]. The Ukrainian emigré historians considered altogether that Galich had became the capital of the Ukrainian state after tardiness of Kiev. Here we can note more soberness and entirely peculiar approaches. Thus, a serious historian allowed for himself only to find the sprouts of the state in Galich [Golovko O. B. 2001, pp. 197–198]. But the 'Galician patriot' sees in Galich the real Ukrainian 'Piedmont' [Chapuga S. 1993, p. 129–130]. But the truth is that this land became the object of the struggle

between Poland and The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and then was incorporated into Poland. A. Ie. Presnyakov wrote about 'the special Galician world', remaining 'forever a province' [Presnyakov A. 1999, p. 56]. Funnily, in the role of the 'first Ukrainian state' one can see and another 'state', for example, Chernihiv land [Kovalenko V. 1994, p. 20].

What is the place of Kievan Rus in the history of the Eastern Europe and in the history of our Earth? D. S. Likhachev compared the Kievan Rus with Antiquity. The prominent soviet historian A. A. Zimin wrote: 'Our Antiquity is what is ancient Rus for Russia. The world, which had no direct continuity with what followed (crushed by the Mongol barbarians), remained a pure legend' [Zimin A. A. 2002, p. 11]. In amazement stood in front of Kievan Rus 'Petersburg's prince of the Slavs', Iu. F. Samarin. He discovered that this period, factually, has not been connected with the subsequent history of Russia. But then brightening it with 'something joy, festive lights'... 'Kievan Rus remains a certain shining prologue to our history' [Samarin Yu. F. 1996, p. 434–435].

I wanted to stop these citations of great people, but had been reminded of Karl Marx. The Old Man, of course, made mistakes and did not love the Slavs, but nevertheless he is Marx. In his famous work, which before 'Perestroika' every historian tried to use, but few tried to read, he wrote about the 'clumsy, cumbersome and precocious Empire which was constructed by the Ruriks'. Factually, it was only one of the chapters of the Norman conquest and this Empire had been a predecessor of the origins Poland, Lithuania, and the Baltic settlements, Turkey and Muskovy by itself [Marks K. 1989, p. 4]. Of course, we can find some error in his reasoning: what about the Turkey? And the Ukraine and Belarus he completely forgot... But in the essence of his reasoning he is right.

Though, it was not a 'clumsy Empire', but high Civilization. The projects of the Civilization were embodied in the centre and in the outlying districts: in the South where the East Slavs came into contact with the nomads and the peoples of North Caucasus and in the North, where their neighbours were the Scandinavian tribes. But to pretend for an inheritance in connection with this Civilization is too hard: there are many heirs and not only (and here Marx is right) the East Slavs. The heirs are all in common, but not separately. There is a similar picture with European Antiquity: what about its heirs? We'll not offend the contemporary Greeks, because they have just such a problem!

Our contemporary historical knowledge convinced us that Kievan Rus is our Antiquity. We have our Antiquity, as the West Europeans have theirs. And in this sense it belongs to the all countries and (I repeat once more) not to a separate country. The Kievan Rus is our pride and joy: there was no state there, no nationality, no stable religion and Church, but it had high culture, freedom and much good. We have to understand that we cannot lengthen the history of contemporary countries of the 'Post Soviet Space' at the expense of Kievan Rus. In this sense the history of West European countries is longer and their Antiquity older than ours. Our states are comparatively young. But our Antiquity is our great pride and not just the object of clashes and historical wars.

## References

- Antonovich V. B. Kiev, ego sudba i znachenie s XIV po XVI st. (1362–1569) [Kiev, his fate and significance from XIV to XVI c.]. *Monografii po istorii Zapadnoy i Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii*, vol. 1. Kiev, 1885, pp. 221–264. (In Russian)
- Bonnar A. *Grecheskaya tsivilizatsiya. Ot Illiady do Parfenona* [The Greece Civilization. From Illiade to the Parthenon]. Moscow, Iskustvo Publ., 1992, 269 pp. (In Russian)

- Chapuga S. Galitsko-Volinska derjava — prakorin zahidno ukraïnskogo P'emontu [The Galicia-Volhynian state — root of the West Ukrainian Piedmont]. *Galitsko-Volinska derjava: peredumovi viniknennya, istoriya, kultura, traditsii* [Galicia-Volhynian state: premises of the Origin, History, Culture, Traditions]. Lviv, 1993, pp. 120–138. (In Ukrainian)
- Dvornichenko A. Yu. Rossiyskaya istoriya s drevneyshih vremyon do padeniya samoderjaviya [Russian History from the ancient times to the fall of the autocracy]. Moscow, 'Ves Mir' Publ., 2010, 939 pp. (In Russian)
- Dvornichenko A. Yu. Zerkala i khimery. O vznikenii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva [Mirrors and chimeras. On the Origin of the Old Russian State]. St. Petersburg, Eurasia Publ.; Moscow, ID Klio Publ., 2014, 560 pp.
- Dvornichenko A. Yu. Tserkov i obschestvo v Drevnej Rusi [Church and Society in Old Rus]. Leningrad, 1988.
- Dvornichenko A. Yu. Ehvoluciya gorodskoj obshchiny i genezis feodalizma na Rusi [The Evolution of Urban Communities and the Origin of Feudalism in Rus]. *Voprosy istorii*, 1988, no. 1, pp. 58–73.
- Dvornichenko A. Yu. Kreschenie Rusi i Litvy v kontekste pottestarnogo obshestva [The Baptism of the Rus and Lithuanians in the context of the Pottestarn Society]. *Drevneiia Rus vo vremeni, v lichnostiah, v ideiah. Almanach* [The Ancient Rus in time, in personalities, in ideas], iss. 3. St. Petersburg, 2015, pp. 76–84.
- Filin F. P. Proishozhdenie russkogo, ukraïnskogo i belorusskogo yazykov. Istoriko-dialekticheskij ocherk [The Origin of Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian languages. History and dialectical Essay]. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1972, 656 pp.
- Froyanov I. Ya. Kievskaya Rus. Ocherki sotsialno-politicheskoy istorii [Kievan Rus. Essays of social-political history]. Leningrad, Leningr. un-ta Publ., 1980, 256 pp.
- Froyanov I. Ya., Dvornichenko A. Yu. Goroda-gosudarstva v Drevney Rusi [City-states in Ancient Rus]. *Stanovlenie i razvitie ranneklassovyih obschestv. Gorod i gosudarstvo* [Growth and Development of early class societies. City and State]. Leningrad, LGU Publ., 1986, 335 pp.
- Froyanov I. Ya. Kievskaya Rus. Ocherki otechestvennoy historiografii [Kievan Rus. Essays of native historiography]. Leningrad, Leningr. un-ta Publ., 1990, 256 pp.
- Froyanov I. Ya., Dvornichenko A. Yu., Krivosheev Yu. V. The Introduction of Christianity in Russia and the Pagan Traditions. *Russian Traditional Culture. Religion, Gender and Customary Law*. Ed. by M. V. Balzer. New York, Leningrad, 1992, pp. 3–15.
- Froyanov I. Ya., Dvornichenko A. Yu., Krivosheev Yu. V. O sotsialnyih osnovah razvitiya pismennosti i gramotnosti v Drevney Rusi [About social foundations of the Literacy and characters in Ancient Rus]. *Spornyye voprosy otechestvennoy istorii XI–XVIII vv. Tezisy dokladov i soobscheniy Pervyih chteniy, posvyaschennoe pamyati A. A. Zimina* [The Discussion Questions Native History of XI–XVIII vv. Thesis of reports and informations the First Conference, devoted to the memory of A. A. Zimin]. Moscow, 1990, pp. 273–279.
- Golubinsky E. E. Istoriya russkoy tserkvi [The History of Russian Church]. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1901, 968 pp.
- Golovko O. B. Knyaz Roman Mstislavich ta yogo doba: Narisi z istorii politichnogo jittya Pivdennoi Rusi XII — pochatku XIII stolittya [Prince Roman Mstislavich and his time: Essays of the history of the political life of the South Rus XII — the beginning of the XIII c.]. Kiev, Stilos Publ., 2001, 249 pp.
- Hrushevsky M. S. Ocherk istorii ukraïnskogo naroda [Essay on the History of the Ukrainian People]. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Kiev, Lybid Publ., 1991, 398 pp. Po izdaniyu 1911 g.
- Hrytskevich A. P. Pradmova dlya 5-ga vidannya [Preface for the 5-th edition]. *Ignatoy'sky U. M. Karotki naryis gystoryii Belarusi* [Short Essay of the History of the Belarus]. 5-e vyidanne. Minsk, Belarus Publ., 1991, pp. 3–17.
- Isaevich Ya. D. «Priednannya chi vozz'ednannya?» M. Braychevskogo — perelomna podiya v ukraïnskey historiografii [Addition or reunification? M. Braychevskogo — turning point in Ukrainian historiography]. *Starojitnosti Rusi-Ukraini. Zbirnik naukovih prats* [Antiquities of Rus-Ukraine. Collection of scholarly articles]. Kiev, Kiivska akademiya evrobiznesu, 1994, pp. 242–249.
- Iusova N. Genezis kontseptsii davnorusskoi narodnosti v istorichniy nausti SRSR (1930-ti — persha polovina 1940-h rr. [The Genesis of the conception Old Rus Nationality in the historical research of the USSR (1930s — first half of 1940s)]. Vinnitsya, TOV «Konsol», 2005, 545 pp.
- Kaiser Daniel H. *The Growth of the Law in Medieval Russia*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1980, 308 pp.
- Kartashev A. V. Sobranie sochinenij: V 2 t. T. 1: Ocherki po istorii russkoy tserkvi [The collection of the works: in two vols. Vol. 1. Essays on the History of the Russian Church]. Moscow, TERRA Publ., 1992, 688 pp.
- Kostomarov N. I. Mysli o federativnom nachale v drevnej Rusi [Thoughts about the Federation Principle in Ancient Rus]. *Bunt Stenki Razina* [The Riot of Stepan Razin]. Istoricheskie monografii i issledovaniya. Moscow, Charli Publ., 1994, 640 pp.

- Kostomarov N.I. Nachalo edinoderjaviya v drevney Rusi [The Principle of the common power in the Ancient Rus]. *Raskol. Istoricheskie monografii i issledovaniya*. Moscow, Charli Publ., 1994, 608 pp.
- Kovalenko V. Chernigovo-Siverska i Galitsko-Volinska zemli u XII–XIII st. (Do pitannya pro pershi osередki davoruskoi derjavnosti) [Chernihiv-Seversky and Galician-Volyn lands in XII–XIII c. Toward the question about first centers of the Old Russian State]. *Drugiy mijnarodniy kongres ukraintiv (Lviv, 22–28 serpnja 1993 r.)*. *Dopovidi i poiidomlennja: Istorija*. Lviv, 1994, part 1, pp. 20–23.
- Krivoshchev Yu. V. *Rus i mongoly: issledovanie po istorii Severo-Vostochnoj Rusi XII–XIII vv.* [Rus and Mongols: Study of the History of the North-East Rus XII]. St. Petersburg, 1999, 408 pp.
- Lastoŭsky V. Iu. *Karotkaya gistoryiya Belarusi* [The Short History of the Belarus]. Minsk, Universiteitskaj Publ., 1993, 119 pp.
- Lashuk L. P. *Vvedenie v istoricheskuyu sotsiologiyu* [Introduction to Historical Sociology]. Iss. 2. Konkretnyie problemy istoricheskoy sotsiologii. Moscow, MGU Publ., 1977, 148 pp.
- Lihachyov D.S. Literaturnoe edinstvo Kievskoy Rusi v period eyo gosudarstvennoy razdroblennosti [The Unity of Literature of Kievan Rus in the period of its state divide]. *Gesellschaft und Kultur in Russlands im Frühen Mittelalter*. Halle (Saale): Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg Wissenschaftliche Beiträge 1981/54 (C 21), 1981, pp. 169–179.
- Lihachev D.S. *Natsionalnoe samosoznanie Drevney Rusi. Oчерki iz oblasti russkoy liteaturyi XI–XVII vv.* [National self consciousness of Old Rus. Essays from the sphere Russian literature XI–XVII vv.]. Moscow, Leningrad, AN SSSR Publ., 1945, 121 pp.
- Marks K. Razoblachenie diplomaticheskoy istorii vosemnadtsatogo veka [The Exposure of the Diplomatic History of the Eighteen Century]. *Voprosy istorii* [The Questions of History], 1989, no. 4, pp. 3–19.
- Mavrodin V.V. *Obrazovanie Drevnerusskogo gosudarstva* [The Formation of the Old Rus State]. Leningrad, LGU Publ., 1945, 432 pp.
- Miller A. I. «Ukrainskij vopros» v politike vlastej i russkom obshhestvennom mnenii (vtoraya polovina XIX v.) [‘The Ukraine Question’ in the policy of power and in Russian public movement]. St. Petersburg, Aletejja Publ., 2000, 260 pp.
- Miller A. *Ukrainskij vopros v Rossijskoj imperii* [The Ukraine Question in the Russian Empire]. Kiev, Laurus Publ., 2013, 416 pp.
- Nimchuk V.V. *Mova. Istorija ukrainskoi kulturi. T. 1. Rozdil 9. Kiivska Rus* [Language. The History of the Ukrainian Culture. Vol. 1. Part 9. Kievan Rus]. Kiev, 2001, pp. 683–693.
- Pax Rossica. *Russkaya gosudarstvennost v trudah istorikov zarubejja* [The Russian Statehood in the works of the foreign historians]. Author-Compil. E. A. Bondareva. Moscow, Veche Publ., 2012, 447 pp.
- Petrov A. V. *От язычества к Святую Руси. Novgorodskie usobicy (k izucheniyu drevnerusskogo vechevogo uklada)* [From paganism to Holy Rus. The Novgorodian Clashes (to Study of Old Rus Veche)]. St. Petersburg, 2003, 352 pp.
- Pivtorak G. P. *Pohodjennja ukraintsev, rosiyan, belorusiv ta ihnih mov. Mifi i pravda prot troh brativ slavjanskich zi «spilnoi koliski»* [The Origin of Ukrainians, Russians, Byelorussians and other languages. Myths and the truth about three Slavic brothers from a ‘common cradle’]. Kiev, Vidavnichij tsentr «Akademiya», 2001, 150 pp.
- Pokrovsky M. N. *Russkaya istoriya v samom sjatom oчерke* [Russian History in a Most Short Essay]. Moscow, Partijnoe Publ., 1932, 549 pp.
- Portnov A. V. *Uprajneniya s istoriej po-ukrainski* [Exercises in history in the Ukrainian manner]. Moscow, OGI Publ., Polit.ru, Memorial, 2010, 224 pp.
- Presnyakov A. Upadok Kievа i istoricheskij put Ukrainy [The Decline of the Kiev and the Historical Way of Ukraine]. *Rodina*, 1999, no. 8, pp. 53–57.
- Presnyakov A. E. *Lektsii po russkoy istorii*. [Lectures on Russian History], vol. 1. Moscow, Gosudarstvennoe social’no-ekonomicheskoe izdatel’stvo, 1938, 240 pp.
- Prisak Omelyan. *Pohodjennja Rusi. Starodavni skandinavski djerela (krim islandskih sag)* [The Origin of Rus: Old Scandinavian Sources, besides Icelandic sagas], vol. 1. Kiev, Vidanitstvo «Oberegi», 1997, 1080 pp.
- Richka V.M. «Galich — drugij Kii»: serednovichna formula chi istoriografichna metafora? [‘Galich is another Kiev’: the medieval formula or the metaphor of historiography? *Kievo-ruski studii*. Nijn, vid-vo NDU im. M. Gogolya, 2005, pp. 119–136.
- Rubinshtejn N. L. *Russkaya istoriografiya* [The Russian Historiography]. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg University Press, 2008., 938 pp.
- Samarin Iu. F. O mnenijah «Sovremennika», istoricheskich i literaturnych [About Opinions of the ‘Contemporary’, histories and literaries]. *Izbrannye proizvedeniya* [Selected works]. Moscow, ROSSPEN Publ., 1996, pp. 434–435.

- Shnirelman V. A. Hazariya v zerkale natsionalisticheskogo diskursa: istoki simvolicheskoy konfrontatsii [Khazaria in the mirror of nationalistic discourse: the beginning of the simvol confrontation]. *Hazariya: mif i istoriya* [Khazaria: myth and history], Moscow, Ierusalim, Mostyi kulturyi, Gescharim, 2010, pp. 316–332.
- Shtyihav G. V., Plyashevich U. K. *Gistoryiya Belarusi. Starajytnyi chasy i syarednyavechcha. Vuchebnyi dapamojnik dlya vuchnyav 5–6 klasav* [The History of Belarus. Textbook for 5–6 class]. Minsk, Narodnaya asveta, 1993, pp. 104–105, 256 pp.
- Schapov Ia. N. Gosudarstvo i tserkov v Drevney Rusi (konets H — perv. pol. XIII v.) [State and Church in Ancient Rus (end X — first half XIII)]. *Gesellschaft und Kultur in Russlands im Frühen Mittelalter*. Halle (Saale): Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg Wissenschaftliche Beiträge 1981/54 (C 21), 1981, pp. 58–74.
- Sedov V. V. *Drevnerusskaya narodnost. Istoriko-arheologicheskoe issledlorvanie* [The Old Rus Nationality. History and Archaeology investigation], Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1999, 312 pp.
- Sobolevsky A. I. Kak govorili v Kieve v XIV i XV vv. [How did the population of Kiev at XIV and XV c. speak?]. *Chteniya v Istoricheskom Obschestve im. Nestora-Letopistsa*. Kiev, 1888. Book 2, pp. 215–218.
- Sobolevsky A. I. *Istoriya russkogo literaturnogo yazyika* [The History of Russian Literary Language]. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1980, 193 pp.
- Tihomirov M. N. Kievskaya Rus [Kievan Rus]. *Drevnyia Rus* [The Old Rus]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1975, pp. 22–41.
- Tolochko A. P. *Kievskaya Rus i Malorossiya v XIX veke* [‘Kievan Rus’ and Small Russia in the XIX c.]. Kiev, Laurus Publ., 2012, 256 pp.
- Tolochko Aleksey. Voobrajennaya narodnost [Imagined Nationality]. *Ukrainskij istorichnij zhurnal*. Kiiv, 2001, no. 3, pp. 29–34.
- Tolochko P. P. *Drevnerusskaya narodnost: voobrajaemaya ili realnaya* [Old Russian nationality: imagine or real]. St. Petersburg, Aletyya Publ., 2005, 218 pp.
- Tomashivsky S. *Ukrainska istoriya. Starinni chasi i seredni viki* [The History of Ukrain. Ancient and medieval centuries]. Lviv, 1919, 154 pp.
- Wilson Andrew. *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*. New Haven and London: Yale Nota Bene; Yale University Press, 2002, 380 pp.
- Zagorulsky E. O vremeni i usloviyah formirovaniya drevnerusskoy narodnosti [About the time and conditions of the formation of Old Russian Nationality]. *Ruthenica*, vol. I. Kiiv, 2002, pp. 105–111.
- Zimin A. A. Dve tsivilizatsii v istorii Rossii. Nedodumannyye myisli. Etyudy i vospominaniya [Two Civilisations in the History of Russia. Tentative Reflections. Essays and reminiscences]. *Otechestvennaya istoriya*, 2002, no. 1, pp. 10–14.

**For citation:** Dvornichenko A. Yu. The Place of the Kievan Rus in history. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2016, issue 4, pp. 5–17. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu02.2016.401

Received: 28 March 2016

Accepted: 2 September 2016